## REMARKS

Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 2-5, 7-10 and 13-14 are currently pending in the present application. Claims 1, 6 and 11-12 have cancelled. New claims 13 and 14 have been added. Claims 2-5, 7, 9 and 10 have been amended in the expectation that the amendments will place this application in condition for allowance. The amendments do not introduce new matter within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 132. Accordingly, entry of the amendments is respectfully requested.

# SUMMARY OF RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

The Examiner has required restriction of claims 1-12 to a single Group amongst Groups I-II under 35 U.S.C. §121. The basis for the Requirement and description of each of the Groups are given in the text of the Office Action and are not repeated herein.

The Examiner has further required the applicant to elect for examination purposes a single disclosed species of salt, (before electrochemical activation) such as sodium chloride or potassium chloride.

### ELECTION

Applicant elect, with traverse, Group II, claims 2-4, 7-10 drawn to a method of treating live animals electrochemically activating an aqueous solution such that the solution includes separable and both of an aqueous, mixed oxidant, predominantly anion-containing solution and an aqueous, mixed anti-oxidant, predominantly cation-containing solution; from the aqueous, mixed oxidant, predominantly anion-containing solution, and introducing the aqueous, mixed anti-oxidant, predominantly cation-containing solution and the aqueous, mix predominantly anion-containing solution oxidant, simultaneously or sequentially to the animal, classified in class 424, various subclasses depending on the nature f the electrolytic products, such as subclasses 601, 661-665, 715, 717, class 426, subclass 532, and class 205, subclass 701+.

Regarding the elections of species, Applicant respectfully submits that the currently pending claims are not directed to any particular species of salt, which was previously disclosed in claim 1 now cancelled. As such, Applicant believes that the basis of this species election requirement is obviated.

## TRAVERSAL

Applicant respectfully traverse the Examiner's requirement for claim restriction.

First, the restriction requirement is traversed because it omits "an appropriate explanation" as to the existence of a "serious burden" if the restriction were not required. See MPEP 803. Regardless of any differences which may exist between the inventions set forth in the different groups, a complete and thorough search for the invention set forth in either of the groups would require searching the art areas appropriate to the other group. Since a search of each the inventions would be coextensive, it would not be a serious burden upon the Examiner to examine all of the claims in this application.

Further at the Examiner's disposal are powerful electronic search engines providing the Examiner with the ability to quickly and easily search all of the claims.

Finally, given the overlapping subject matter, examination of the claims in this application would not pose a serious burden, because the searches would be coextensive in that a search of any one of the invention Groups I-II would require searching the prior art areas appropriate to the other invention Group.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the requirement for claim restriction and examine all claims pending in this application.

### CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding requirements and examiner all claims originally presented. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the foregoing, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,

NATH & ASSOCIATES PLLC

Date:

\_\_\_\_

Gary M. Nath

Reg. No. 26,965

Tanya E. Harkins

Reg. No. 52,993

Customer No. 20529

#### NATH & ASSOCIATES PLLC

112 S. West Street

Alexandria, Virginia 22314 Telephone: (703) 548-6284 Facsimile: (703) 683-8396